Application No. 10/695,404 AMENDMENT UPON FILING OF REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION Art Unit 3765 Page 4

REMARKS

By the preceding amendments, claim 1, upon which the other claims depend, has been amended to recite that the puncture-resistant material is resistant to puncture by snakes or by thorny or spiky plants. The preceding amendments are supported by the original specification, *e.g.*, page 4, lines 12 *et seq*.

Grundstrom teaches, in a paragraph bridging columns 1 and 2, that "[t]he lower portions of the trouser legs 10—10 are tubular members 12—12 secured to the upper portions 11—11" and that "[s]aid tubular members 12—12 may be made of asbestos or other material having the advantage of resisting heat."

The applicants submit that asbestos is not a puncture-resistant material, which is resistant to puncture by snakes or by thorny or spiky plants. Grundstrom does not disclose or suggest what "other material" might be instead used. Grundstrom does not disclose or suggest that such "other material" would be a puncture-resistant material, which is resistant to puncture by snakes or by thorny or spiky plants. Grundtrom is not concerned with resistance to puncture by snakes or by thorny or spiky plants. The applicants submit, therefore, that claim 1 is not anticipated by Grundstrom.

The applicants submit, moreover, that no modification of the trousers of Grundstrom in view of Baxter, which merely discloses a protective garment incorporating an abrasion-resistant fabric, would provide the lower region of each leg portion of the modified trousers with a layer of puncture-resistant material, which would be resistant to puncture by snakes or by thorny or spiky plants. The applicants submit, therefore, that claims 2, 3, and 4 are not obvious over Grundstrom in view of Baxter.

[to next page]

Application No. 10/695,404 AMENDMENT UPON FILING OF REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION Art Unit 3765 Page 5

In a telephone conference on June 6, 2005, wherein the undersigned attorney proposed the substance of the preceding amendments to the patent examiner, the patent examiner replied that such amendments would require a further search. The undersigned attorney submits that, unless the further search reveals newly cited art bearing on anticipation or on obviousness, claim 1, as amended by the preceding amendments, and the dependent claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

By Allen J. Hoover

Reg. No. 24,103

Wood, Phillips, Katz, Clark & Mortimer Citicorp Center, Suite 3800 500 West Madison Street Chicago, Illinois 60661-2511 Telephone (312) 876-1800 Facsimile (312) 876-2020 June 6, 2005